REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are presently pending and stand rejected.

Claims 14, 16, and 18 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." Office Action, at 2.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malladi in view of Sugiyama.

Examiner has indicated that "Malladi is silent in regards to writing a start code starting at a byte in a middle portion of a data word in a memory. However, Sugiyama teaches writing a start code starting at a byte in a middle portion of a data word in a memory. However, Sugiyama teaches writing a start code starting at a byte in a middle portion of a data word in a memory ([0123] and fig. 13A and 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to … combine the teaching of Malladi with Sugiyama's teaching of the start code starting in the middle of the word…".

Assignee respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that if Malladi was modified "writing a start code starting at a byte in a middle portion of a data word in a memory", Malladi would not be operable for "fetching data from the memory starting from the byte".

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1, as well as to dependent claims 2-6.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Malladi in view of Sugiyama. Claim 7 recites, among other limitations, "storing a start code at a byte in a middle portion of a particular one of the data words" and "providing data from the memory starting from the starting address". For at

8

least the reasons indicated in claim 1, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 7.

Additionally, claim 7 recites, among other limitations, "a direct memory access module". Examiner has indicated that Malladi teaches "a direct memory access module for providing data from the memory starting from the starting address (Malladi, column 21-24)". Assignee calls Examiner's attention to the fact that Malladi appears to have only 22 columns. Moreover, there is nothing in columns 21-22 that would suggest a "direct memory access module". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 7 for at least this reason as well.

Additionally, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Malladi in view of Sugiyama, in view of Son. Examiner indicated that "wherein the direct memory access module (Malladi, column 21-24) further comprises: a buffer comprising a plurality of data words for storing the video data from the starting address (Malladi, Malladi discloses where the parameters are loaded into a predefine memory location, column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 1-8." Malladi, Col. 8, Lines 3-5 describe "a quantization matrix identified in sequence header 14 is loaded into a predefined memory location on a video core (VCORE).

Assignee respectfully traverses because Malladi does not disclose the VCORE as part of a direct memory access module. Accordingly, Malladi does not teach "the direct memory access module further comprises: a buffer".

Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection to claim 14 as well as to dependent claim 18.

Assignee traverse the rejection to claim 16 and 17 for at least the same reasons indicated in claim 14.

Additionally, claims 14, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 14, 16, and 18 are amended. Assignee will attempt to explain the claims. There is a "masking register … comprises a plurality of bytes corresponding to byte positions of the data words". The state machine loads the "first masking register with a pattern". "[E]ach byte of the plurality of bytes in the first mask register that corresponds to a byte position that is <u>less than the four least significant bits of the starting address are loaded with a first value</u>" and "each byte of the plurality of bytes in the first mask register that corresponds to a byte position that is <u>equal or greater than the four least significant bits of the starting address are loaded with a second value</u>".

Assignee respectfully submits that claims 14, 16, and 18 now comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of

the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted

January 16, 2008

Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100